DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 372 VT 004 301

Focus on Vocational Education. NAM Congress of American Industry. (72nd, New York, Dec. 8, 1967).
National Association of Manufacturers, New York, N.Y. Education Committee.
Pub Date 67
Note-23p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.25
Descriptors-*Conference Reports, Educational Change, Educational Finance, Educational Needs, Educational Planning, *Educational Trends, *Federal Aid, Federal Legislation, Federal Programs, Financial Needs, Financial Support, Job Training, Military Training, Poverty Programs, Speeches, *Vocational Education
Identifiers-*National Association Of Manufacturers

The Congress of American Industry of the National Association of Manufacturers attempted in their conference to answer some questions related to defining vocational education, directing vocational education, and the role of the U.S. Office of Education. Major papers presented were: (1) "New Directions in Vocational Education," by Grant Venn, (2) "The Need to Invest in Education," by Sar Levitan, and (3) "The Dispersement of Vocational Education Funds to the State," by Albert H. Quie. The text of the questions and answers session, which was held following the presentations, is included. (CM)

FOCUS ON

VOCATIONAL

EDUCATION

Focus On
Vocational Education

NAM ~~72nd~~ Congress of American Industry

December 8, 1967, New York, N.Y.

A Publication of the Education Committee,
National Association of Manufacturers • 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. ~~10017~~

Preface

Vocational education is changing—some say for better, some say for worse. Industry's manpower needs are also changing—some say faster than the schools can adjust.

There's disagreement over goals—some say the public school system should stick to basic education, leaving job-skill developments to others. Many disagree.

There's uncertainty over methods—some say we should centralize finance, decentralize administration. Many disagree.

While the debate goes on, the national government's Office of Education is the growth industry of Washington. Its budget has grown from $.75 billion in 1959 to $4.3 billion in 1967, and its staff from 1,300 to 2,100 in '65 and to 3,200 in '66.

What is vocational education? Who should direct it? What is the role of the U.S. Office of Education?

These are some of the questions answered by

DR. GRANT VENN
Associate Commissioner of
Vocational Education
United States Office of Education

DR. SAR LEVITAN
Professor
George Washington University

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
U.S. Representative, Minnesota

Moderator
MR. ROLAND M. BIXLER
President, J-B-T Instruments, Inc.
New Haven, Conn.
Chairman, NAM Education Committee

New Directions in Vocational Education

Dr. Grant Venn

Only ten years ago, no voice from any source was heard opposing, criticizing or praising vocational education. In fact, it was difficult to find three persons who were interested in discussing vocational education.

The situation is different now. The role and objectives of our educational system are questioned and criticized because social and economic forces have demanded a change in perspective and attitudes. Changing conditions in our society have created an entirely new environment: new insights, jobs, industries and national objectives.

Advances in science and technology have created imbalances in the nation's social, economic and educational institutions and have changed the nature of human problems. Some of the symptoms that graphically illustrate these transformations are the manpower shortages in skilled and technical occupations, the high unemployment rate during peaks of prosperity, the difficulty young people experience in breaking into the world of work. No one is more aware of these symptoms than employers.

Moreover, old values and traditions are questioned; many have been discarded. We have racial problems which must be solved; we have poverty pockets throughout the nation which must be eliminated.

Better housing, more industries, more jobs or bigger welfare payments, and huge outlays for remedial programs will help, but may prove to be only short-term solutions. Past failures in coping with mounting social problems and change have shifted a formidable burden on our educational system. Therefore, any hope for permanent solutions to the problems which threaten our nation's solidarity lies in the education and cultivation of each citizen for a productive and meaningful life. This means changing the functions, aims and substance of education in relation to the whole society and to human interests and values.

Industry, the business community and education must share the responsibility for improving the entire process of education, which must include occupational education.

The present generation of young people is engulfed in a whirlpool of change. For this reason, it seems that today's adults, who were educated or conditioned for a role in a stable society, will be the first generation with responsibility for educating the youth and re-educating adults to the new dimensions of time and change. Because methods which solved problems 30 years ago help so little in solving problems today, experience seems almost a handicap.

Here are some basic issues which pose a challenge for educators and representatives of industry.

First, segments of our society are being locked out of the work world because of technological change. Even though the overall unemployment rate is now less than 4 percent, it is about 16 percent for all youth between the ages of 16 and 22 and is double that for Negro youth.

The isolation of adolescents and other groups from the total economic and cultural pattern of society is a major problem. In the last 25 years, our school system has closed its doors to about 40 percent of the nation's young people.

Before we became a technological society, the youth who did not graduate from high school could become contributing citizens in our society; the only prerequisites were a willingness to work, good health and brawn.

When we had a stable, agricultural economy, our public schools were "selecting out" rather than "selecting in" institutions. Many people still believe that the school system should teach only those who want to learn. What then is the future for the more than one million youngsters who drop out of high school each year? We know, and the dropout learns, that the lack of a high-school diploma spells disaster. Today's work world has no place for him.

Therefore, it is incumbent on the nation's business and industrial leaders to support educators in urging that the role of the schools be changed—to encourage the development of programs centered on individual interest and experience so that every youngster will remain in school and acquire a job-entry skill.

Once we believed that economic stability meant em-

ployment for all the able-bodied. Even today, growth in the Gross National Product means more jobs for more people. But the real key to *full employment* in our country is education–developing the potential of each individual for a productive life in our society. Therefore, educational experience at any level, in the public school system, or postsecondary technical school, or college or university, must be a bridge to the world of work.

President Johnson put it aptly in a recent address when he said:

"As we approach the next century, every citizen who hopes to play a productive role in American society must have occupational training of a sort–whether he wants to be a brain surgeon or an airplane repairman, or an X-ray technician or an astronaut.

"Before the year 2000, we will see startling changes in science and technology: change will simply wipe out hundreds of occupations that exist today . . .

"If we are to step into the future without stumbling, we must produce trained citizens in this country.

"We must help the one million students in our land who each year drop out–cutting themselves off from education, when the thing they need most in this world *is* education."

The second issue concerns the lack of a national manpower policy for determining priorities, particularly the investment of public funds in developing manpower for occupations below the professional level. We have had a long-time policy that regulated or dictated the investment of public money to provide professional personnel in the fields of law, medicine and engineering. But we failed to foresee, or underestimated, the results of change in relation to manpower needs at the technical level. In fact, it was just ten years ago that the federal government realized the seriousness of the manpower gaps in the labor force and decided to fund manpower training programs.

Then, the federal funds appropriated to support vocational programs over a four-year period were insufficient. The planners simply underestimated the extent of the manpower problem and manpower requirements.

Third, in our present society, most people will have to change their occupations four or five times, before retirement. Therefore, as a long-range policy, learning simple, specific job skills no longer makes sense.

In the past, the best horseshoer in a community–if he stayed sober and treated people right–always had a job. The only place now with a shortage of horseshoers is New York City; some 20 qualified applicants would meet the city's need for shoers.

The time has come for vocational education to change both its functions and aims. Vocational or occupational education must do more than provide a job skill as an immediate utility. It must provide a broad education and a marketable skill suitable to the times and the need. Educators must reject the proposition that the proper role of vocational education is simply to be the caretaker of those who fail to make the grade in some more general system. Vocational education must be made a part of the mainstream of education, for it can teach persons the technical skills which are now so desperately needed. In addition, it can help the public school system, especially in large cities, cope with its growing heterogeneous student input.

Fourth, the transition from public school to work is just as important in terms of our national welfare and the individual's welfare as is the transition from school to college. Yet the community has always supported the idea that the school's role is to assist only in the transition to a higher educational level.

We realize that the public school system was never assigned the task of helping youngsters who are not college-bound to find jobs suited to their interests and abilities. Thirty years ago, this service was unnecessary. But the traditional or conservative role of the schools must be altered because the educational process must become concerned with the future and welfare of the whole society, not a chosen few.

Fifth, many youngsters are unaware of various work opportunities and occupational categories, and of the skills and preparation they need for job entry.

The changed nature of work has virtually barred our young people from a realistic role in the work world. Education has little meaning or reality for thousands of young people who cannot move into a successful role in society because they lack aspiration, background, environment or proper ties with their family, their community or their country. Therefore, an occupational orientation and guidance program at the junior high school level should be developed to acquaint young people, especially the disadvantaged, with the wide variety of jobs in business and industry, with the skills needed for each occupation and the compensations the jobs offer.

The many remedial programs supported by federal funds are proof that our schools have not extended, nor have been asked to include, this service. Remedial and corrective programs are not ideal but are necessary as short-range solutions to problems of the disadvantaged and the unemployed.

Today, a person's role in society is determined largely by his work role. Therefore, occupational education is

a fundamental necessity for an individual's well-being. So our premise is that there is a relationship between education and work.

Schools, with the cooperation of business and industry, must offer work-experience programs to students in which they can develop skills and receive credit. Work-experience is as important to the high school student as it is to the college student and cooperative school-work programs can be a real asset to the youngster seeking to enter the job market.

A new link must be forged between business, industry and education. In today's technological world, traditional classroom instruction is no longer enough. Youngsters must be taught how to make out job application forms, taught job-interview decorum and good work habits. They must know how to get along with their co-workers and supervisors, how to dress properly for the job, and how to develop skills on the job.

Here business and industry can play a vital role by supplying schools with instructional material, machines and part-time instructors, and by cooperating with the schools in accepting pupils for part-time work and supervising them in work-experience programs.

A partnership between schools and industry will be a step forward in providing maximum education for each youngster in our schools—education for the development of his intellectual capabilities and for a productive vocation.

Thomas Jefferson said that "the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge. . . . No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness."

These words are even more true in the 20th century than they were in the 18th century. In this century, President Johnson said: "There is nothing so important to freedom in the world, to liberty in the world, to the dignity of man than education."

The Need to Invest in Education

Dr. Sar Levitan

DR. LEVITAN: Thank you, Mr. Bixler. Last week after completing my remarks for this occasion, I had lunch with a friend of mine. I mentioned to him that I had prepared some serious remarks for this meeting, and since he is an excellent raconteur, I asked him for a good joke for the occasion.

I told him that my prepared paper will deal with the Job Corps and the need for providing residential facilities for poor kids. I went on to say that I would also stress the need to invest additional billions of dollars in ghetto schools.

Instead of telling me an appropriate story, my friend responded with a question: "Didn't you say that the paper is to be delivered before a Congress of American Industry?" After a short pause he added: "You don't have to worry about jokes, they'll laugh at you anyway." (Laughter.)

Vocational training, as presently practiced in our secondary school system, has little relevance to the needs of educationally deficient youth. Statistical "proof" for this statement is hard to come by, but ample circumstantial evidence supports it. Possibly the best evidence is supplied by the large number of school dropouts from poverty-stricken areas. For the educationally deprived youth, the major function of the public vocational school is to provide a "dumping ground" until he is ready to leave school. The best that can be said for these schools is that they offer narrow vocational training, frequently outmoded and providing little occupational preparation for future career development. A large share of the responsibility for the disturbingly high unemployment among youth and critical unemployment conditions of Negro youth may be placed at the doorstep of our educational system.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 made provision for serving those who did not succeed in the traditional vocational education program because of "academic, socio-economic and other handicaps." Thus far, the federal Office of Education has not offered any evidence, to the best of my knowledge, showing that the additional $200 million annual federal contribution to vocational education has resulted in any efforts to carry out the Congressional mandate. It appears that vocational schools left the difficult chore of training disadvantaged youth to other federal programs which might take over after he leaves school, or after the school has failed him.

In his authoritative study of federally supported manpower programs, my colleague, Dr. Garth L. Mangum, commented on the effect of the 1963 Vocational Education Act:

> There has been little meaningful innovation under the act and a great reluctance to adopt proven experiments demonstrated on projects financed by foundations, OEO [Office of Economic Opportunity] and MDTA [Manpower Development and Training Act] funds. Training occupations still reflect more the 1917 categories than current labor market needs. Offerings for those with special needs account for no more than 2 or 3 percent of total expenditures, even with generous definitions. Programs in rural schools and urban slums are limited and poor—just where they are needed most. This generally dismal picture is belied by some real bright spots, but in general change has been slow and minor.

Professor Mangum is also a member of the Presidential Advisory Council on Vocational Education. We'll have to wait another few weeks to see whether the full council agrees with him.

Antipoverty Efforts

Recently inaugurated manpower programs attempt to provide for the deficiently educated youth and to make up for the failure of the public educational system. Four major alternatives are available:

1. Neighborhood Youth Corps
2. MDTA Skill Centers
3. Job Corps
4. The Armed Forces

Neighborhood Youth Corps

The Neighborhood Youth Corps has a double function: to provide part-time employment to youths from

impoverished homes who are attending school and to help those who left school to "develop their maximum occupational potential." Despite the clear Congressional intent, some might question the appropriateness of including the Neighborhood Youth Corps as a training program.

In practice, it may be described more properly as an income-support program. The funds allocated to the program are distributed about equally between the in-school (including summer) and out-of-school projects. There is considerable evidence that the in-school program is effective in preventing youth from dropping out of school. For example, the Pittsburgh school system found that during the school year 1965-66 the dropout rate among NYC enrollees was half that of the rest of the school population. Since members of the NYC come from impoverished homes, it might be expected that their dropout rate should be higher than among youths who come from a more affluent environment. The NYC support of about $15 a week apparently made the difference.

It is more difficult to justify the out-of-school program as an income-maintenance program. Since the bulk of the participants in the program are high-school dropouts, the emphasis of the program should be upon providing remedial educational and prevocational or vocational training. Few projects, apparently, provide these services in a systematic manner.

The reason for this is not hard to find. Given limited resources, the administrators of the program determined to serve a maximum number of clients. The result has been that the bulk of federal funds is expended on providing income to participants. Provision for remedial education, health and other supportive services which many NYC enrollees need to improve their employability is left to the ingenuity and effectiveness of local project directors. Youths participating in the program are normally assigned to public or non-profit private organizations. Too frequently their assignments are in the nature of "make-work," not leading to skill acquisition or better opportunities for employment. A sample survey of former out-of-school NYC enrollees showed that only 5 percent of the boys were employed by the agencies to which they had been assigned for work experience after they left NYC and 13 percent of the girls were in the same category. There was little direct relation between the NYC assignment and later employment.

The out-of-school NYC program remains a mixture of work experience, income support, anti-riot insurance and "aging vat." The rationale for the latter is based on the fact that the unemployment rate among youths declines as they mature from teenagers into adulthood. There is room, therefore, for a program which would provide them with some income and work during their early years in the labor force.

MDTA Skill Centers

In contrast to NYC, the skill centers established under the Manpower Development and Training Act emphasize remedial education and prevocational training. These centers are an outgrowth of the multi-occupational projects which attempted to expose trainees, mostly youth, to a variety of occupational choices.

The need to establish skill centers, separate from the local educational system, was due to the fact that in most communities adequate facilities were not available and in some cases the local school system refused to cooperate with MDTA projects. Utilizing MDTA funds, the Office of Education encouraged development of skill centers—centralized facilities providing counseling, prevocational training, basic education and skill training in a variety of occupations. Ninety-four percent of the participants in the 70 to 80 skill centers during the past year received instruction in basic education and nearly half of the projects called for 600 or more hours of instruction before or during skill training phase.

Though federal funds supply the bulk of support for NYC and MDTA—the federal share is 90 percent of total costs and the local balance may be supplied "in kind"—the two programs operate entirely separately. In some communities the skill center facilities are underutilized and remedial education could be provided to NYC enrollees at minimum cost.

Regrettably, skill centers segregate remedial education from the more prestigious functions of the school system in spite of the fact that broader social contacts and increased institutional prestige resulting from combined facilities would be helpful to the disadvantaged.

The goal should be to have, within commuting distance of all but the most isolated populations, a single institution or a combination providing the following: (1) two-year technical courses in a wide range of skill areas; (2) shorter, more specialized vocational-training courses for those unable or unwilling to carry through the more demanding courses; (3) adult basic education courses to compensate for deficient education and prepare for skill training; (4) prevocational orientation needed for rational vocational choice; and (5) residential facilities for youth living in sparsely populated areas where remedial educational and training services cannot be delivered and for those living in a debilitating environment where they cannot undertake effectively a course in basic education or acquire the rudiments of a trade.

Job Corps

The Job Corps is the most controversial of all the programs in aid of disadvantaged youth. The issue is not the need for remedial education and training, but the

high cost of residential facilities, amounting to about $8,000 a year per enrollee. The cost per Job Corps enrollee would be justified if enrollment were limited to those whose needs could not be met by a less costly alternative program and if the enrollees remained long enough to benefit from their experience. The evidence on both points is not conclusive.

The record of the Job Corps is clear—at no time was there an attempt to "cream" applicants, a common feature of other federally supported training programs. The Job Corps extended the welcome mat to all youths from impoverished families. The agency was even willing to take chances with youths convicted for felony, if an appropriate review board decided that the applicant was willing to conform to Job Corps standards. It does not follow, however, that Job Corps enrollees were carefully screened or that adequate care was taken to offer alternative programs for applicants when appropriate.

The difficulties experienced by the Job Corps in motivating enrollees to remain in centers for an adequate length of time to effect their future employability remains a crucial problem. Follow-up studies of former corpsmen indicate that six months' enrollment represents the crucial cut-off period needed to make the Job Corps experience a "success." Regrettably, more than a majority of corpsmen leave centers before that length of time.

There is, however, increasing evidence that as center administrators, counselors and teachers acquire experience in coping with problems of youths from disadvantaged environment, the retention power of the Job Corps is improving. The high dropout rate from Job Corps centers is a reflection of inadequate experience in dealing with voluntary residential facilities for youths from slum areas and not an argument against the need for such facilities.

A grievous error committed by the Job Corps has been to "go it alone" without involving the vocational educational establishment and state vocational education institutions. Not that the latter have shown any burning interest to help the disadvantaged, but the technical expertise of vocational educators could have helped the Job Corps avoid many mistakes.

Instead of seeking the cooperation of the state vocational educators, the Job Corps turned over its conservation centers to federal agencies which had little experience in education and training and most of the urban centers were administered under contract to private corporations, including General Electric, IBM, IT&T, Philco-Ford, RCA and Westinghouse. It was hoped that corporations which had traditionally engaged in personnel training and the development of complex defense systems would have little trouble developing new approaches and techniques for educating and training the disadvantaged.

It does not appear that the corporations have lived up to these expectations. The high cost of running centers has forced the Job Corps to cut operating expenses and has reduced budgets for research and development in educational and training activities at the centers. With such budget constraints, corporate contractors have attracted few proven top-level educators or administrators, frequently having to settle for ordinary, garden-variety educators.

Perhaps the most successful contractor has been the Texas Education Foundation, an independent, nonprofit corporation established by the State of Texas to operate the Gary Job Corps Center. The success of the Gary Center, which with an enrollment of 3,000 is the largest urban center, was largely due to the active interest of Governor John B. Connally. He mobilized outstanding state educators to administer the center and business leaders to help develop curricula and place corpsmen.

Interestingly, the Gary Center was run by the same educational establishment which presumably failed the youths in schools. The experience of Gary suggests that, given more adequate support (including money) from businesses and the community at large, the educational system might fare better in serving the disadvantaged.

The Armed Forces

The Armed Forces offer an alternative to the Job Corps in providing residential facilities. Understandably, like any other employer, the military sought the most qualified personnel to perform its mission and until the escalation of the war in Vietnam, one of every three youths was rejected by the Armed Forces because he could not live up to the physical and mental standards. The majority of rejectees came from impoverished homes and suffered some health defects or had failed to achieve even a rudimentary education. Thirty percent were Negroes and most of them came from states or school districts that provided a deficient education.

Faced with the need to expand, the Defense Department relaxed its eligibility requirements and has recruited or drafted during the past year 100,000 men who were ineligible for military service under the more stringent standards that prevailed earlier. Though nearly half of the 100,000 men inducted under the new standards had completed high school or better, the median reading achievement was only that of a seventh grader and one of every four achieved a reading ability of less than a fourth grader. Thus far, the Armed Forces have provided little organized remedial education and most of the re-

cruits have been necessarily assigned to occupations which require no skill, and the training they receive may not be transferable to civilian occupations. One of every three was assigned to infantry, ground crews and allied specialties.

Since none of the recruits under the new standards, except dischargees, have completed their military service, it is not clear whether their experience in the Armed Forces will improve their future employability. The Defense Department is planning a follow-up study of the group.

Private Employers

No mention has yet been made about the hiring practices of private employers. As their contribution to the nation's war on poverty, these employers have lowered hiring qualifications and trained workers who would normally not be acceptable. Their rationales have ranged widely. Labor shortages accounted for some of the hiring, but not all. Some consider their action as "enlightened self-interest," a reaction to riots that occurred in many cities. Others, opposed to the expansion of the welfare state, think that they can motivate and train the disadvantaged better than public programs.

Though the number enrolled is small, the experience is valuable for the lessons that can be gleaned from it. The much-touted JOBS NOW of Chicago is an example. Here a private nonprofit organization, the YMCA, provides an initial two-week orientation to hardcore "gang" youth. This orientation, and the provision of coaches to work with the youth while on the job, is subsidized by federal funds. The brunt of the costs, however, is assumed by private employers who hire the participants at their going rate of pay and provide a high-support environment and training for poorly qualified employees. Though some of the largest companies in Chicago participate in the program, they agreed to absorb only about a hundred participants every two weeks.

This program and others have, however, indicated the costs of hiring unqualified and, frequently poorly motivated workers. A large insurance company which hired 20 high school dropouts found that to make them competitive with high-school graduates might cost as much as a thousand dollars per enrollee during the initial year. There are other costs, not the least of which is concerned with retaining poorly prepared and motivated employees. This involves not only extra costs for supervision, but also reorienting supervisors to deal sympathetically with the problems of the new employees. There are also dangers—bending disciplinary rules and work performance standards which, if not adroitly handled, can adversely affect overall productivity.

Private corporations cannot be expected to act as eleemosynary institutions to any substantial degree. If inadequately educated and poorly motivated workers are to be trained and equipped with skills to enhance their position in the competitive market, the government must absorb the brunt of the costs, either through tax incentives or by direct subsidies. Rather than "viewing with alarm" the use of tainted government money, there is room to be concerned that there ain't enough of it.

My remarks have focused upon remedial provisions needed to compensate for the failure of the public school system to educate and prepare for productive lives the hundreds of thousands who drop out annually from high school or even complete their course of study.

For the Long Pull – The Need to Invest in Education

One of the lessons that we have learned from recent antipoverty experience is that we are starting the formal educational process too late, at least as far as the children from poor homes are concerned. Many poor children, by the time they reach public school age, are already "retarded" in comparison with children brought up in a more favorable environment.

The evidence is mounting that these disadvantages can be overcome, or at least minimized, by providing child development services at age three. Nursery and kindergarten experience, enriched by nutritional and health components, is only a first step. Considerably more must be done to improve the quality of education throughout the primary and secondary schools, particularly in poverty-stricken areas.

To help youths to become competitive in the labor market will require not only the reorientation of our educational system, but also the allocation of vast resources. Until that commitment is made, society will continue to provide patchwork remedial measures, which in the long run may be more expensive than the commitment to improve the quality of ghetto education.

The Disbursement of Vocational Education Funds to the States

The Honorable Albert H. Quie

As we meet here today, another major education controversy looms large on the national horizon. This controversy will revolve around the future direction of American vocational education. Thus far, the rumblings of those who are dissatisfied have remained largely out of public earshot. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, II, has publicly stated that he is disappointed in its progress. Many of my colleagues on the House Education and Labor Committee have severely criticized vocational education as a creature that looks backward —offering job skills and training that are now obsolete and out-of-step with the sophisticated employment demands that are imposed by a fast-moving and dynamic urban society.

My distinguished colleague from Oregon, Representative Edith Green, with whom I serve on the House Subcommittee on Education, has indicated that vocational education should be a top-priority item on the Congressional agenda. Congressman Roman Pucinski, Chairman of the General Education Subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, has given me assurance that a thorough, in-depth study of vocational education will be made next year with an eye toward writing comprehensive legislation to expand the level of federal support and participation.

Sometime next month, the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, created under the provisions of the Act of 1963 and chaired by the Commissioner of Education, will submit its initial evaluation of our vocational education programs. The recommendations submitted by this council are expected to have a major impact on any amendments that will receive Congressional consideration during the Second Session of the 90th Congress.

All in all, it looks like an exciting and challenging year ahead for all parties interested in the future of vocational education.

Vocational education has evolved from an individually initiated, informal educational experience into a major component of our American educational curriculum. Other than the Land Grant college legislation, it was one of the earliest to receive federal support. Its importance, in relationship to the growth of our national economy and the development of our human resources, is now fully recognized by educational policy-makers at all levels.

Passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 marked early Congressional concern and the beginning of our national commitment to support this facet of education. It seems to me that Congress functions most effectively when a national crisis strikes. In 1917, as World War I neared an end, there was a realization that oceans could no longer protect us from the problems of nations that are away from our continent. Rather, it was our great industrial might that enabled us to win the war. Congress reacted by enacting legislation to provide further training in vocational skills

The Smith-Hughes Act was narrow and limited in scope. Funds were allotted to the states for the salaries of teachers, supervisors and directors of agricultural subjects as well as for teachers of trade, home economics and industrial subjects. In addition, funds were earmarked for aid in the preparation of teachers in these subject areas.

Congress reacted in a similar manne after the end of World War II, when the Vocational Education Act of 1946 was enacted. More popularly referred to as the George-Barden Act, it was also based on the categorical approach with funds earmarked for agriculture, home economics, trade and industry, distributive education, fishing trades and industry, practical nurse training, and the training of highly skilled technicians in occupations requiring expertise in scientific fields necessary for our national defense.

This reaction-to-a-crisis approach was again seen with the enactment of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. At that time, the American people were shocked by the fact that the Russians were capable of launching a Sputnik space vehicle. The Soviets successfully

launched their vehicle well in advance of comparable American efforts. It was concluded that our scientific and mathematical abilities and expertise were lacking. And if we were to retain world leadership, we would have to expand our store of knowledge in these areas as well as in modern foreign languages. Congressional reaction to this crisis took the form of the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

Most recently, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 reflected a deep national concern—a concern for the nation's poor. As the result of the book *The Other America* by Michael Harrington, the American conscience was heavy with guilt over the plight of the poor. According to the provisions of ESEA, the greatest amounts of money are allocated to the nation's school districts based on the number of poor children attending. These funds, however, are not distributed among "poverty" children. Rather, each school district receives monies on the basis of the number of poor children living within its boundaries in 1959.

When I mention the date 1959, this should give you some idea of just how outdated our statistical base is. For example, in Kentucky, 81 counties have had a net reduction in the number of children between the ages of five and seventeen. But the mechanism of the act perpetuates this inequitable distribution of funds. In a word, in 1967, we were distributing monies to school districts on the basis of the number of poor children that they had back in 1959.

But let's return to vocational education. Seventeen years elapsed—from 1946 until 1963—before the Congress took concerted action to align vocational education with the nation's projected manpower needs and passed the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

That act incorporated some major changes. First, the agricultural-rural bias or weighting that had characterized previous legislation was eliminated, and second, the so-called "block grant" concept was introduced into the realm of vocational education.

To remove the agricultural bias or emphasis that was so much a part of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden Acts, the Vocational Education Act of 1963 contained language that would permit any of the funds that had been earmarked exclusively for agricultural training to be transferred to or combined with the funds that had been authorized to support new training programs. In other words, a state could use its money for whatever programs it felt would lead to gainful employment.

Prior to this, as I have said, vocational education had been categorically limited to agriculture, home economics, trade and industry, and distributive education. Now, business and industry, too, offered a broad range of employment opportunities—but there were no federally assisted vocational training programs for them.

That there was a need and a desire for this was evident in the huge overmatching of the states and the communities in vocational education.

Not only was the agricultural bias removed, but the distribution formula was completely revamped. Funds were no longer allocated on the basis of rural or farm population, but on income and the population within the state. Let me add, parenthetically, that I believe that this is an ideal foundation on which to base other federal aid. For, in the Vocational Education Act of 1963, there was at least an attempt made to develop a national manpower policy. There was no such policy, and I am frank to admit that. As Dr. Venn has said, we have no manpower policy today. Whether or not Dr. Levitan said it in as many words, one had only to listen to his speech —for the point was made that we have no national manpower policy today.

At least we do have some of the makings for such a policy and the beginning of the development of one in the Vocational Education Act of 1963. That act, with its block grant structure, required that each state develop and submit a comprehensive state plan to the Commissioner of Education for his approval. In its plan, a state must establish its policies and spell out those procedures that will determine its allocation of these federal monies —giving adequate assurance that the manpower needs and employment opportunities within the state are given appropriate consideration.

Though state involvement was limited, states were, nonetheless, required to develop a long-range blueprint for the spending of vocational education funds awarded to them by the federal government. Under the terms of the Vocational Education Act, the school districts receive their monies but not on a project-by-project basis which finds the Office of Education, the OEO, and the Department of Labor flooded with thousands and thousands of individual project proposals that must be processed and reviewed.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963, then, represented our first real national commitment to support vocational education. In that act, we laid the foundation for future action that would guarantee us the capability to meet the challenge of the manpower crisis that will confront us in the decade of the 1970's. Our commitment was a firm one; the legislative history of the act makes it abundantly clear that our intent was the right one.

The question still remains: Have we honored and fulfilled that commitment? In dollars and cents terms, I

think that we have done a fairly good job. But, this is not to say that we don't need substantial increases in the appropriations in the years that lie ahead–for the obvious need is now recognizable.

In the fiscal year 1967, the federal government alone expended $1.4 billion for three manpower training and vocational efforts. Two-hundred and seventy-eight million dollars was spent for vocational education, $390 million for manpower development and training, plus $734 million for a variety of work training programs authorized under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. In addition, $353 million was spent for Project Head Start and over one billion dollars for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. So you can see, in terms of money, the federal government has made a substantial commitment.

But the authorization and appropriation of funds in Washington is not the sole answer. These funds must be funneled to the states and the local communities in order to have them used in the most effective way. The federal government doesn't run these programs itself. If the federal government is going to make large commitments of dollars, and if when the war in Vietnam comes to a close there is a substantial increase in this federal outlay, we must determine how to best make this available to the states and the local communities.

This is the vital question confronting us at this time. Currently, there is no single method for financing vocational education programs at the state and local levels. The method of funding is different for each of the programs that I have mentioned–so much so that I consider these programs, for the most part, to be merely federal "patches" on the total governmental and private effort.

In my conversations with school administrators across the country, one theme runs through all of our discussions: state and local educational authorities are finding it increasingly difficult to carry out educational programs according to priorities which are responsive to local needs. This is the case because in order to participate in federal categorical aid programs and to receive needed federal dollar assistance, state and local educators must devote more and more of their time to paperwork and red tape. This costs the American taxpayer millions of dollars annually–and these dollars should be going to support bona fide educational programs for our children.

The tragedy of all this is that carefully designed programs and adequate dollar expenditures do not add up to a national manpower policy. In the absence of such a policy, conflict, duplication and waste will prevent us from fully honoring our commitment to first-rate quality vocational education training.

Let us, for a moment, look at some of the conflicts that have arisen and at the effects of present methods of funneling federal funds to the local levels. First, let's consider the matching requirements of the various vocational education programs. Vocational education under the auspices of the Health, Education and Welfare requires 50 percent state matching, while vocational rehabilitation requires only 25 percent. The Neighborhood Youth Corps, MDTA and adult education under the Office of Economic Opportunity require a 10 percent state matching of funds, while in the Job Corps and ESEA there is no requirement for state matching of federal dollars. These are only a few of a vast number of federal programs that all have different matching provisions.

What this means is that when you try to determine just how your local or your state money is to be utilized, you are left with "bargain-basement shopping." You try to get as much of the federal money for the least amount of local or state money. And this undertaking will throw the entire program–the national as well as state and local efforts–out of balance.

We must also consider how the states apply for their funds. Most of the operative programs find funds granted on a project-by-project basis. This is not a block grant approach but a categorical one in which the projects are developed locally.

I enjoyed a comment that appeared in a new study that is being conducted now on the educational systems for the 1970's. That comment was that they are going to ask for unsolicited proposals. And I wonder whether or not that is really possible. All of this categorical aid–all of the project-by-project allocation of funds–requires that one become proficient in the art of "grantsmanship"–that is the ability to weave one's way through the endless bureaucratic maze and the mountainous piles of red tape. Those who are able to develop a project proposal that is the kind that the reader likes to read will usually get their projects funded. You must develop a program that will include not only what you really want and need but also one that you think will get funded. Only in this way can you be assured of getting your money. And if you don't get your money, then your superior isn't going to like you very well. In the field of higher education, they say "publish or perish"–here it is "get your grants or you're out."

Let me reiterate–the costs of this type of administration are high. The waste in terms of talent and in terms of the taxpayers' dollars defies precise calculation on a nationwide basis. Dr. Arthur Swanson, Council Associate for the Western New York School Study Council, told the Members of the House Education and Labor Committee that "the New York State Education Department requires approximately 30 times the manpower to

distribute $1 of federal (categorical) aid than is required to distribute $1 of state aid."

Poorer and smaller state and local educational agencies just do not have sufficient manpower to satisfy federal paperwork requirements. Unable to surmount the bureaucratic barriers that confront them, they see federal monies awarded to larger and wealthier educational agencies and districts whose needs are not the most urgent or critical. Finally, the state matching requirements serve merely to broaden the gap that exists between the wealthy and the poor states.

In some of the programs, we do have an equalizing factor so there is more money available to the poorer states. But, then, in vocational education, they have that 50 percent that they have to contribute themselves which makes it extremely difficult for some of them. I must say, for a number of the poorer states, that they have done extremely well in the field of vocational education.

If one wants to criticize the southern states—and this seems to be the fad these days—one should look at vocational education and compare some of the southern states with the northern states and see how well these southern states have done in vocational education.

There are a number of conflicts that plague this area. There is the conflict between the academic and the vocational which is going on in the secondary schools. There is a conflict between technical education at the higher education level and vocational education that is post-high school and won't fit into the college curriculum or into vocational education at the secondary school level. There is also the conflict between institutional programs and on-the-job training programs.

None of these has been resolved. They have been kept below the surface as much as possible. I always think it better if these disputes are brought out into the open and various points of view aired. Perhaps some parties who are not directly involved in the field could play a major part in resolving them. It is, in a sense, much like when my Democratic colleagues begin fighting with each other and we suggest that they ought to let a Republican come into their midst and help them to resolve their differences.

Francis Keppel said that education is too important to be left to the educators. Maybe in some of the conflicts among educators, outsiders ought to be welcomed in their midst in an effort to bring about agreeable solutions. So, if there are educators among us here today, as I know there are, I would say to you that you should feel free to share your problems with your business and industrial leaders, with your community—and let them help you.

In the conflict that pits academic against vocational education, the major emphasis in our secondary schools is on the curriculum for the college-bound student. My daughter who is now a junior in high school would like to pursue something like the Peace Corps or perhaps a line that would enable her to work with less fortunate individuals. She wants to do this right after high school. She tells me that most of the guidance and counseling is in terms of what college she ought to go to. I have asked her what kind of training she is going to get in high school for what she would like to do and she says that nobody ever talks about that.

And so our whole emphasis is on preparation for that 30 percent that are college-bound—or perhaps on that 20 percent that go far enough in college so that they can learn a skill from it. I have seen the statistics that show that of the young people who leave school and go out to work with less than a baccalaureate degree, only one in ten have a job skill to take with them. And that's a pretty poor record for our education system.

The heartening fact is, however, that our educators are aware of this shortcoming in our system and I expect that they will play their role in making long-needed changes.

The development of a sound national manpower policy is an urgent and necessary undertaking. It is important that we address ourselves to doing this and doing it now. At the same time that the federal government is developing a national policy, state and local governments should be encouraged to do the same at their respective levels. Each of these partners must establish a policy and make plans for implementing it. The passing of time will not resolve our problems. We're moving at too fast a pace. And we must plan for the future. Industry would not be where it is today, if it neglected to plan. This is what we must do in the manpower field.

We have a multitude of programs, not only in vocational education and in poverty, but also in the Department of Labor. I doubt that it will ever be possible to develop a national manpower policy if the people in the Office of Education jealously hang on to their prerogatives, and those in the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Labor cling to theirs. Surely, none will suggest that some of these prerogatives be given up.

We hope to do a thorough study on the creation of a single manpower agency this year—and the result should be a new Department of Education and Manpower. I believe that we should place all of the education and manpower-training functions and responsibilities that are now in the Office of Education, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor and in the National Science Foundation in a new cabinet-level department.

The manpower programs of the Department of Labor cannot and should not be isolated–for academic and vocational education go hand in hand. The Office of Economic Opportunity cannot go it alone. It would be a tragic mistake if we continue segregated programs in which a "poor" person is identified as somebody who is different. The "poor" must associate with other people –and we shouldn't run these programs only for them. What is more, there are a significant number of young people who need the experience that Project Head Start provides, who need vocational training, who need manpower training–young persons who do not come from families that are in the "poverty" category.

I personally believe that now is the time to start gathering together and consolidating into a unified whole the fragmented parts of our national education and manpower programs. Once such a consolidation is effected, we can then begin to devote ourselves to the task of perfecting and expanding our vocational education programs and in so doing draw upon the creative and innovative potential and expertise of the three co-equal government partners–federal, state and local.

Many of you may be familiar with the recent controversy over my amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act–an amendment that would have consolidated all of Titles I (aid to educationally deprived children), II (textbooks and library resources), III (innovative programs and supplemental centers) and V (aid to state departments of education) under a single title, with all of the programs administered through a single state plan. Each state, after having drawn upon the expertise of all interested parties, would have prepared a comprehensive state plan that would be submitted to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for his approval. Federal aid would then go from the commissioner to the state. The commissioner would not then be dealing with thousands of school districts around the country, but with the 50 states. The states, in turn, would be dealing with the hundreds of school districts within their jurisdictions. I believe that this is the direction in which we should be moving.

I was not successful; my proposal was defeated. But, as a result of the ESEA debate, it is widely recognized that the anti-crime bill that passed the House–a bill that incorporates the block grant concept–came as a result of the ESEA identification and dramatization of the block grant approach. The juvenile delinquency program, heretofore quite unsuccessful in its five years of operation, now has that as well.

Some might say that this is the basis of the Green Amendment to the anti-poverty legislation. I say that it is not. And here I would like to point out another factor that is of primary importance in the partnership among the federal, state and local spheres of government. In that partnership, the people who are to benefit from a program must be involved in some way–and this is especially important in the field of poverty. The poor must play a major role in their self-betterment. This is the key to the success of Leon Sullivan's O.I.C. program in Philadelphia. The poor are involved. The same can be said of Project Bootstrap that operates in Los Angeles, and by the way, without a cent of federal money. Involvement of those who are to be helped has been a major ingredient of Bootstrap's success–boasting a record of placing 92 percent of those whom it trains–most of them in electronics and communications.

And the same should apply in our schools. In our rural schools, in the old one-room schoolhouse, there was a source of strength that we seem to have discarded. I am not advocating that we return to the one-room schoolhouse–I went to one–but I would never want my kids to go to one. But the strength of the rural one-room schoolhouse was the fact that the teacher had to live on a farm in that community and the parents of all the children had the responsibility, at least once a year, if not twice, to invite the teacher to come to the home for dinner. The kids were scared to death.

But the parents were pleased with this arrangement. For in the environment of the home, they could discuss the child's education. Now, parents are expected to go to the school for meetings with the teacher. The children, of course, don't come along. In the ghettos, the parents are scared because the teacher or instructor looks like "authority" and is practically like the policeman. I do know of some schools that require that the teacher visit the homes of his students. In New York, you can't do that because of the union. Teachers can only work six hours and 20 minutes a day in New York, I believe, and you can't tell a teacher to go and visit the students' parents in their homes.

But, where they do this, the parents don't come into a strange environment, frightened to death. Rather, the teacher goes into the home environment, frightened to death perhaps. But by this, they were able to accomplish more than school social workers. And this is an ingredient that we must remember–the individual's part in his own development.

With respect to job programs, it is imperative that persons are put on policy-making boards who have graduated from industrial vocational education programs. And it is important to have persons who have gone through these programs within the last five years–for they know the problems that existed for them–not the problems that existed some 20 or 30 years ago when they might have gone through some vocational education program.

Let me summarize briefly. We must work to create a new cabinet-level Department of Education and Manpower. I would suggest that we should lump together programs in certain categories—and I say this because I do not believe that we should put all education and manpower programs together under one single block grant. We have to do this a step at a time. We should put the elementary and secondary education programs, ESEA Titles I, II, III and V, the National Defense Education Act, Title IIIA—which is the equipment title—Head Start and Follow Through together into one block grant and develop a comprehensive plan. Vocational education, too, should have a block grant. The Smith-Hughes Act, the George-Barden Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, MDTA, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Job Corps and similar programs should be placed together in that block grant.

I believe that this way we can have the coordination that is necessary, develop a policy, have the flexibility and have the strength of programs that will have dynamic effect on the opportunity for the nine out of ten young people who need to learn some occupational skills as well as all the other training that they need, in order that we actually can solve the problems that face us in the cities and the rural regions of America, because jobs come closest to being the answer. Education is necessary now, in order that people might have jobs.

Questions and Answers

MODERATOR ROLAND BIXLER: Because our time has run a bit longer than anticipated, I'm going to cut this internal discussion down to ten minutes arbitrarily here, just to get something started, and I hope you will be getting those questions right at the tip of your tongue so that we can get on and have actual audience participation with the panel. So, for any panelist who wants to quiz another one, this is a good time to start.

DR. VENN: I have a question for Dr. Levitan. I know you are aware that the majority of the skill centers in the manpower program are operated in schools. Since both the youngsters and the facilities are there, are you proposing that the schools themselves become the kinds of skill centers developed for the manpower program?

DR. LEVITAN: Definitely. I think that the best thing would be to make the skill centers part of community centers not limited only to the disadvantaged kids. These centers would also offer technical education for those who do not go to college, but are interested in learning a technical skill in a two-year course as well as diverse adult education courses. Remedial education would thus be only part of the total community center efforts, and would avoid the present stigma attached to segregated remedial education programs. The school system can do the job. The question is, will the school system reorient itself to labor market needs, which it hasn't done so far.

DR. VENN: With the same amount of money appropriated for the MDTA programs?

DR. LEVITAN: No, you can't do it with the same amount of money that MDTA gets. Mr. Quie stressed that the federal government has contributed a great deal during the last few years. I agree. The federal contribution to the manpower programs that we are talking about –for less than the college bound–amounted only six or seven years ago to about $250 million. The present annual federal outlay is two billion, an eightfold increase. But I believe that this is far from enough, and that we need to multiply those amounts several times to do the job that has to be done.

MR. BIXLER: Well, as an employer I am often asked how do you find–and I think this is typical of most employers–what do you find about the products of the schools now? Are they suitable and so forth? Well, I read these reports that say the pupils are much better educated today, they can pass all sorts of tests far better, but I would have to report realistically that they still aren't good enough in a great many cases. There's a real gap that still needs to be met on the job, and that every once in a while I've seen big gaps in the basic education which has gone on before.

Now, any time you talk to a company president, he will invariably say in response to the question, "What kind of people are you looking for?"–well, we'd like nice broadly trained people who understand things in general and we'll provide the specifics from there on. When you're a job applicant and you get around to the employment office, then they want to know have you ever run an NCR bookkeeping machine before, or what do you know about this kind of mill, or have you ever been a receiving clerk or something else that's very, very specific.

Now, somewhere in between I hope there's a common ground, but I wanted to ask you, Dr. Venn, if it's your feeling that in the work study program and these others that you were referring to, there was a hope that we could have an almost completely trained individual or would you see a good deal of training still being needed even after a person was out from under the school system?

DR. VENN: Well, I think there certainly are going to have to be programs for continued training and retraining. I hope any employee you hire will be a "completely educated" individual, meaning he will have specific, salable skills before applying for a job. Then the schools and business should work together and assume responsibility for upgrading the training of employees.

After all, your managers and administrators are the best educated employees in your business because they continue to go to school.

PANELIST: I was going to ask Congressman Quie a question that will expose my complete ignorance, I think, but is the suggestion you've made today for a new department headed by a Cabinet status officer, as I recall to be called the "Department of Education and Manpower"–is this a new proposal that was just made today or is this being considered seriously?

MR. QUIE: It's a new proposal I just made today, I've thought on a long time. Some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have talked about this. A few Democrats have–the only one I really know of, though, Mrs. Green of Oregon has kind of toyed with the idea, but she's mostly recommended the Department of Education and sort of added the "Manpower" as an aside.

But I think that we're going to go into the next year and really do a job on vocational education and man-

power programs, that we've got to have some kind of goal that will raise the –or develop the national policy, and this is the way I think that you can do it.

I think you need somebody at the Cabinet level who can pull them together. Less than the Cabinet level isn't able to do it. They tried to do that on the poverty program with OEO, and Sargent Shriver was never given that kind of power. It's a sub-Cabinet-level agency and therefore hasn't been able to coordinate. But I think this is of such importance, you need it at that level in order to bring it about, and to leave portions of it in various agencies separate from each other where there has to be a forcible communication, I don't think will actually do it either.

PANELIST: Dr. Levitan, how does that proposal strike you?

DR. LEVITAN: In one word, Amen.

MR. BIXLER: That's a succinct word. I start to see some hands out in the audience. Why don't we proceed right on?

A VOICE: May I speak as a practitioner in the field of education, superintendent of a city school system. I'd like to take issue with a couple of comments that Dr. Levitan–first of all, re-directing the activities of education to the Department of Labor. Who do you think does MDTA anyway? Our schools. You have a federal agency coming into our community from the Department of Labor, contracting with the schools to do the job.

I don't know what you analyzed from Washington. All I know, what's happening out in the field, that the public schools are doing this job now, except instead of contracting with the U.S. Office of Education, we're contracting with the Department of Labor.

Now, with Congressman Quie, I think we have a very serious problem, Congressman, and possibly you're not fully aware of it.

The administration of the Vocational Act of 1963 has been basically rural-oriented. If you're to do a study of the expenditure of funds in this nation, particularly in our state, I would think you would find that vocational education money is still being diverted to the rural areas of America, and it seems to me the theme of our conference here is the urban crisis and the problems of urban America. But yet we do not seem to have the feeling from the federal government, and I might say from the state government it's equally – the feeling is not there because we no longer have a rural-oriented state legislature; we have a "crabgrass" legislature with the suburbanites.

What I'm saying is, if we're going to meet the needs of the great cities of America, we're going to have to have some feeling from the national Congress and also from the state legislatures.

It wasn't a question. I guess it was a speech. Thank you.

MR. QUIE: I have to comment, though, on your speech. I find in the Congress that we have a great deal of rural and crabgrass representation, too. It just happens that in the center city there aren't enough state legislators or Congressmen or Senators in order to give them a majority, and evidently never will.

Now, when the 1963 act was written, I tried my best to eliminate all the categorical programs of the Smith-Hughes and George-Barden acts. I figured that the home-economics programs and the agriculture programs could go in there and make – in the competition, compete for the funds, it would be good for them, the competition would make them stronger.

But the old money for George-Barden and Smith-Hughes stayed earmarked. We were unable to change it. However, the new money is not earmarked, and I wonder then if it's true, and Grant Venn can give us the figures I hope, on the amount of the new money in the '63 act that goes for rural programs.

But if it isn't–if it is going to rural programs, I wonder about the voice of the urban people, because there is no representation on the boards that I know of that says it has to be for the rural areas.

Some way or other, locally, your city voices are pretty quiet, or you haven't gone to the right places, or you don't know how to use it, and so I'd throw it back at you, too, because I think the opportunity in the '63 act is there for you to take effective action in your state planning.

DR. VENN: Well, the 1963 act does authorize the transfer of federal funds allotted states under the George-Barden and Smith-Hughes legislation. In 1963, 44 percent of the federal appropriation, or 44 cents of each federal dollar, was used for the home-economics and agriculture programs. In 1967 the amount spent for the two programs dropped to 17 cents per federal dollar.

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Levitan, do you want to answer the other?

DR. LEVITAN: Yes. I wish that my enemy had written a book. The green sheet distributed to participants of this session mentions me as co-author with Garth Mangum of a study which favored placing the funding of manpower programs under the auspices of the Labor Department. Since Mangum is not here I can blame him for anything controversial that appears in that study.

In this study, which appeared under the modest title *Making Sense of Federal Manpower Policy,* we favored Mr. Quie's approach, a department of education and manpower.

We thought, however, that Congress would not go along with it, so we proposed an alternative single funding source to be administered by the Department of Labor. Now that Mr. Quie is on our side, I would put the programs in a department of education and manpower.

I do not favor a separate education department. It is necessary to give education greater labor market orientation. It is therefore necessary to combine the manpower aspects with the education aspects.

MR. BIXLER: Let me add one other thing. In the preparation of the NAM policy, one of our subcommittees that's very much concerned about the urban side of things also pointed out for example the American Indians, mentioned those on the reservation and so forth, where there are some real areas that need attention.

In some parts of the South, for example, there are very low educational standards. This is true, also, in some sparsely settled portions elsewhere, and many times, those people are coming on into the urban centers and adding to the problems just as much as if they had been born and brought up there.

Now, may I ask just one other ground rule from here on, as we want to proceed with the next questions, and that is, if you'll give your name and occupation, just so that we have a sort of frame of reference, or if we're talking about a locality, we'll know where it is.

Now, you have the mike down here. Why don't you proceed? Oh, that's not a mike? Excuse me.

A VOICE: From the standpoint of – oh, I am an administrator, in fact, I'd say about a third of my job is writing federal programs, and this is after supper and Sunday after church.

My concern is this. I don't know, I have – that you would even have an answer, but I want to point out that the feedback from the standpoint of evaluating the federal programs, perhaps this is not fair to our state people, but it seems to me that too much emphasis is upon the state man who not only interprets what we submit, but also our evaluation, ESEA, the last one that was sent out was nice and streamlined, but you can't put into numbers and figures these brief checkmarks you're allowed to make, the kinds of effective programs that you accomplish, and I wonder if, when we start to evaluate, we are talking about implementation, and a part of implementation, the final part, will be evaluation of all these federal programs that have been written.

My concern is how we at the grassroots, and I'm way down at the bottom of the root, can get this message back to you as to the effectiveness of the programs.

MR. BIXLER: You're addressing it to Dr. Venn?

VOICE: Yes, I am.

DR. VENN: I think one of the most effective ways is to simply tell about an outstanding program and how it's working. I think we don't get enough of this. We get a lot of statistics which don't have much meaning, but we don't have much feedback that may be taken onto the Hill about specific kinds of programs that are benefiting young people and adults, specific descriptions.

MR. BIXLER: Now, who has the next microphone?

A VOICE: It seems to me there are literally dozens of unanswered questions about vocational education and we have implied many of them today. I'm Wesley Face from Stout State University, and we have a project funded by the Vocational Act of '63. At that time only 10 percent–I think these figures are correct–of the money was pegged into basic research.

Well, it seems to me the other 90 percent is going to build a fortress of programs before we have the basic findings in. I wonder if the panel would care to react to this point?

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Venn?

DR. VENN: The 1963 act specified that 10 percent of the total appropriations should be used for research, but actually a smaller percentage has been spent for research. The Congress reduced the amount. If we continue to spend the 10 percent, I think we're going to have to do something while we're waiting for new ideas. And the things we know how to do ought to be done more quickly.

However, we must remember that each federal dollar invested in vocational education programs across the country is matched by $3 of state and local money. For this reason, some of the states believe they should be able to determine how to spend their $3.

In fact, I've heard a couple of comments on that, and they were strong ones. The point is that even if we knew exactly what we should do, there's still a heck of a gap between what research results show and the business of getting individual communities and individual political subdivisions to change rapidly enough.

A VOICE: I'm Jessie Kennedy, an educator from Detroit, and I have a short, quick question for the Congressman.

Will or will not the development of this national manpower policy about which you speak weaken the role that the local school district or the state departments of education can play in planning?

MR. QUIE: I think some people may look askance at

a new Department of Education and Manpower and development of the national policy, feeling that this may then dominate all of the state and local. But—and it's possible that it could. But if the American people are aware of it and the educators, and the strong belief that there is, as was mentioned by our chairman, that education is a state responsibility and a local function, that there'll be enough desire to keep the state and local governments in their traditional responsible role and let that innovation and creativity exist.

I don't believe that there is a majority of people who have an insatiable desire to centralize everything in Washington. What has been happening has come by default. They haven't done enough locally and statewide. And I believe if you develop a national manpower policy through this agency and fund it through the kind of block grant approach, so that each state will be required to develop its state plan within the guidelines and criteria laid down for the national policy, that this actually can mean more flexibility and freedom of action locally and really the opportunity to solve their needs and in this way there will be less of the unbalancing effect of the present categorical aids.

MR. BIXLER: Here's a question that was sent up, and let me read this one, and then we'll proceed on to the next one.

"Dropouts complain that school interferes with their education. What about the will to be educated?" Dr. Levitan, is that one of your specialties?

DR. LEVITAN: I'm sure I didn't plant this question. Well, there's no question that a debilitating home is not a very good environment for education, but at the same time, the question is, to what extent is the present education in rural areas and in ghettos relevant to whatever aspirations those kids have?

I think that in too many cases the education that is provided in schools is not relevant, and therefore escape from it is a very rational solution to the problems of these kids. And the need, therefore, is to reorient the education system along the lines that Dr. Venn suggested, which would make school more meaningful to the kids from this kind of a home.

MR. BIXLER: I want to point out, incidentally, or remind you again, that copies of the three talks will be available when you leave. We don't normally move — we're not able to move quite this fast, but we thought today there would be so much meat in these that you'd want to take it right along, and I'll remind you to pick it up on the way back.

The gentleman in the back had the next question.

A VOICE: I have a comment to Representative Quie concerning the teachers' visitation. I am a teacher, Don Rankin from Marshalltown, Iowa, and I might comment to both sides of this question. One would be from the teachers' standpoint, if they were paid more money and did not have to take a moonlighting job, which many, many of the teachers have to do, they probably could spend the evening hours visiting the homes, but on the second part of this, if they were to visit the homes, they very likely would not find the parents at home.

I know that in our own particular situation, we call on absentees, and we very, very seldom find 50 percent of the people at home. The student who is home sick answers the phone and if we say, "Can we talk to your mother or your dad?" "They're working." This would be in answer to that.

My second question I would like to say, and I think that Dr. Levitan almost got to the real crux of the problem. We're talking about providing money and help for training these people for industry and business, but I don't think it's the real problem. When Dr. Levitan talked of getting down to the three-year-old, this is the crux of it. The central city is not a society as we know it. The central city is a jungle, and you have to go in there and control these people from three years on. You have to teach them the value and the pride that goes with a society — the value of work, the pride in doing a good job.

Many of the people that you train in the Job Corps still do not have this pride or know what the value of work is, and who would want to employ someone who will come back and steal you blind or sabotage your production by not doing a job, because they don't care. All they want is the money. If they could get it just by coming and going home each night, that's what they would do.

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Levitan, that sounds like it's down your alley.

DR. LEVITAN: I —

MR. VENN: I'd like to reply to this, Bix, if I may.

MR. BIXLER: This is another Mr. Venn.

DR. LEVITAN: I will defer to Mr. Venn.

MR. VENN: Grant phoned me several years ago and wondered if we were related.

We tried to check out all of our pre-survivors if you will, and we found no connection, but he's done a marvelous job here.

DR. VENN: He comes from the side that we're, you know, honorable people .

MR. VENN: Yes, I know. I'm from the North.

Now, one point I'd like to make is, there seems to be a terrific amount of misunderstanding of what's required in business. We've had a very interesting experience in Houston. Can you hear me, all?

MR. BIXLER: Why don't you identify your company, too, if you will?

MR. VENN: I'm Russell Venn of the very "Humble" Oil and Refining Company. (Laughter.)

First only to Texaco. But we've had a very interesting experience. We tried to find out what it took to educate youngsters to participate in our company operations, and we undertook an experiment with the University of Houston, Phil Hoffmann and Texas Southern University, a colored group. Dr. Jones was president at the time, acting president. And what we found was that the counselors in the high schools did not really know what it took to get a job with a company in our area.

So, some 20 companies got together a program, and this has been going on now about three years, I guess, and the first thing we did was to put these counselors through what we call our employment test, and that was something. Second thing we did was to give them an orientation course in our manufacturing operations, all sorts of industries in our particular area.

We paid their expenses. This may be out of date now, but at the time, as I recall, it was about $100 a week plus expenses, so that they felt no obligation whatsoever to be on their own, and we exposed them to what it took to be an employable in our company and other companies, some 20 across the city, and finally, at the end of about two weeks, when they got through this tour, we had a discussion program that started at the Rice Hotel. Some of you remember Jesse Jones, he happened to own the thing, and he's donated it since to a foundation. and we started out at eight o'clock in the morning, and the questions and discussion, instead of quitting at twelve noon, lasted on through lunch until seven o'clock in the evening.

And this was the most worthwhile application of what business can do to indoctrinate people. These counselors found out for the first time, instead of advising this youngster to go into church or science or teaching, what it took to become a part of business, and these people visited with minority groups in our company and others that were actually doing jobs out in the field, scientific jobs, and we think this has been a great step forward, and this started out—we're not original—this started out in Detroit, as I recall, Wayne University, of which I happen to be an alumnus, started a program with several automobile companies, and we think this is a way towards introducing to our young people what training they must have if they're going to qualify to compete in this world.

MR. BIXLER: Thank you. Dr. Levitan, do you want to add to that?

DR. LEVITAN: Yes, I do. No question that the business community can play a much more active role, as Mr. Venn just suggested. We were talking during lunch that one thing that the business community can do is to give continuing refresher experience to school counselors so that they would have a better appreciation of job content and job opportunities, and not just talk in the abstract about becoming a minister or whatever other alternatives you mentioned, Mr. Venn.

I also want to comment on the remark of the gentleman who spoke before Mr. Venn. He asserted that we are talking here about a jungle—about people with different values. I am not at all convinced that this is the case, and we do not have any evidence on that.

What we do have is evidence that society has treated the people in that "jungle" by different rules than it has treated the rest of the population. If we would possibly change societal attitudes toward them. then I'm not so sure that their values would be at all different from ours.

So, before we blame anybody for having different values or "undesirable values." let's stop treating them as being apart from society. In plain words, let's stop racial discrimination—that goes for schools, housing, employment, etc. And until we want to face up to that, I don't think that we can make any judgment that "they" are different than "we" are.

MR. BIXLER: The lady from Detroit is going to add a postscript, I think.

MISS KENNEDY: Yes, I want to thank Dr. Levitan for those comments in answer to the gentleman from Marshalltown, Iowa. I'd like to speak not as a Negro educator, but as an educator concerned with young people in general. I happen to be in charge of a region in Detroit that has approximately 30,000 students, none of which are in the heart of the inner city.

When he talked in terms of a jungle and the fact that these youngsters are not interested in learning, it points out another aspect that I think the speakers might have touched on, not only for necessary new trends in vocational education for students, but in education in teacher training, and that is the whole sensitive area of attitudes.

This morning Dr. Kenneth Clark was on the Today program, and he commented very graphically that in this vital area, educators are untrained in human relations and in human psychology. So, I would submit that all of us think very seriously on attitudes of teachers and the need for change in teacher education in addition to changes that are needed in curricula in the schools.

MR. BIXLER: Thank you. Now the gentleman behind you.

A VOICE: My name is Peter Quami, and I'm from Mankato, Minnesota. Albert Quie mentioned poor people. I have two sons at St. Olav's, so I am now qualified as "poor."

Anyhow, I am also a member of the school board in Mankato, and I sit until twelve, one o'clock in the morning trying to decipher Title I, Title II, Title III, Title V; and I get a little concerned about the fact that I spend so much of my time, and the superintendent spends so much of his time on all these programs.

It seems to me that in one of these talks the best program was run by the state of Texas. This was one that was successful. I think it was successful because it was at a lower level.

We talk in terms of two billion dollars the federal government is giving back. I wonder where the federal government got it in the first place. They probably got three billion, took a billion for management fee and sent back two billion to us.

Now, this is an exaggeration, but this is the idea, and it seems to me that the federal government would be better if they would stay out of education except possibly for research departments, and let us at the local level determine whether or not we want our people to study in the agriculture, home economics—let us determine where and what—how we're going to spend our money. Thank you. (Applause.)

MR. QUIE: I'd like to answer that because there are many people that would like to see the federal government out of education.

Now, I would have preferred that the federal government had not gotten into education. I would have preferred that. But they're there now. The ESEA authorizes something like three billion dollars, is funded at about a billion and a half; but this is the expenditure of the federal government in the communities of the country.

There are very few school board members in the country who will say, "Let's stop that federal program and increase the property tax to pay for the programs ourselves." Very few, not enough to do it. They'd sooner, I think, get it from the state legislature.

There are very few state legislators, however, who will say, "Let's stop those federal programs and increase the income tax or the sales tax and pay for them ourselves."

And then in Congress we find that as soon as the programs are established and a substantial amount of money goes into one's Congressional District, then one wants to keep bringing home the bacon to the constituents. This was evidenced by the fact that the most conservative member of Congress always votes for federal aid to school districts because he gets better than three million dollars for his Congressional District.

Now, I think the federal aid to impacted school districts is one of the biggest boondoggles we've got. I just think it's terrible the way it's distributed. Montgomery County, the richest county in the United States, gets about five million dollars, where I live. And I can afford to pay the property taxes in Montgomery County for the education of my children, but we can't even amend that law to prevent those inequities, because more than half of the members of Congress get a substantial amount of federal aid to impacted school districts in their Congressional Districts.

Now, I think I get about $12,000 in my Congressional District, so it isn't enough for me to vote for it. I vote against it if I can get it separate, by itself. I'd sooner see it go out of the program.

But recognize the most conservative member of Congress, who has made many speeches against federal aid to education, has been voting for it. So, knowing that human nature is as it is, you won't find the school board members, the state legislators or the members of Congress saying let's stop that two billion dollars.

We're going to have that kind of expenditure even if the Republicans control the Congress by as big a margin after '68 as the Democrats did in the 89th Congress. They still would do that.

So, if that's the case, then I say, let's write these programs so that the federal government plays its role in getting money back there, not as dominating and controlling through categorical aids, which has given more of a federal influence to our schools than those of us who voted against general aid before even anticipated it would do.

So, that's what I say, let's use the block grant so the states can play their role in developing a plan for their state, not depend on expansion of regional offices, so Minnesota has to go to St. Louis on some programs, Chicago on other programs, but rather for the state to play its role in this great federal system we have, where we have dual citizenship of a state and of the nation. This is the strength of our system. It's tremendous, and it has evolved, but let's understand what that federal system is.

The federal government is now going to play a role. We can't turn it around. So, let's make a program that will enable you to exercise your responsibility to the school board in Mankato, and your school superintendent, and not have to do it so you're just overwhelmed by a maze of project programs all over, but so that you can develop one, a plan for your community in Mankato, Minnesota can for the state, and we can for the nation. This is what I'm driving for as a Republican.

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Venn? Excuse me, Dr. Venn? You were going to comment on this, too?

DR. VENN: Yes. The big problem is the greatly changed situation during the last two decades in terms of population distribution. Even now close to 800,000 people a year move from the rural areas to the cities. We discussed the population shift to the cities with each state in relation to a state equalization program. So the problem to be solved is how to get sufficient money to the locations where the students are and the need is greatest.

MR. BIXLER: I'll take the chairman's prerogative to call for just two more questions. Let's have yours.

Would you like to use the mike, just to be sure one can hear you?

A VOICE: New York City has just begun to close out its vocational schools, and I would like to ask Dr. Venn or Dr. Levitan, is this in keeping with the present trend of doing this in a given school where everybody–there's a mix, so to speak, in the pupils?

DR. VENN: As I understand the proposal, and I don't know if it is now being carried through, vocational programs would be offered in comprehensive schools instead of a single or special vocational institution. This would simply call for a different administrative arrangement without limiting the vocational program opportunities already available to students. Actually, this move would expand the program.

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Levitan? One more question? Yes?

A VOICE: I'm from the Board of Higher Education, and it is my concern, right along with the educator from Detroit–is about educating the teachers who are going to teach this.

What are we doing in the area of training teachers to do vocational and technical education? Traditional teachers colleges constantly want to go over to more liberal arts, more humanities and social sciences. In some instances, the teachers who teach in vocational schools are people who either are retired from business or they got kind of tired doing the jobs they were doing or some of them have to fulfill the most idiotic teacher certification requirements in order to be able to hold a job.

What is being done in this area?

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Venn?

DR. VENN: Well, I think one thing that is being done is the attempt to develop a different job classification other than teacher for persons who we could use in our schools. I think there are many people who could fit into these jobs; perhaps people with skills in the vocational area could work under a certified teacher who knew teaching methodology. In other words, they could serve as teachers aides or special technicians of some kind.

There is a new law just passed by Congress called the Educational Professions Development Act which will provide funds specifically for retraining programs for teachers. The act includes the vocational and technical area.

MR. BIXLER: Dr. Levitan, you had a comment on that, too?

DR. LEVITAN: I would add to what Dr. Venn said, that here is a place where the business community can play a very active role by offering continuing refresher courses for the vocational education teacher, through summer employment or whatever other techniques might be feasible, so that the vocational education teacher would keep current with the developments in his field and not teach in 1967 techniques of 1947 or maybe 1917.

This is a place where the business community can make a real contribution and possibly spend some money very usefully.

MR. BIXLER: Congressman Quie, you were going to add a postscript?

MR. QUIE: Yes. I'd like to, because this is a policy question that must be decided by the Congress this coming year. This past year, in 1967, we passed the Education Professions Act, in which we put together in Title V the Higher Education Act, all of the–or most all the teacher training programs, trying to consolidate them in one as I talked about earlier in other programs.

Also, as you noted, I said, I don't believe we ought to have a block grant now for all of education, but I would put the vocational programs together and the elementary and secondary school ones in the other.

At the present time, the vocational education teachers' training will be a part of Title V of the Education Professions Act. Can they be left there and receive their just share for the training of teachers? Or in our expansion and improvement of the Vocational Education Act this coming year, do we set aside a separate title for the training of vocational education teachers?

I'm open on that. The Administration, I believe, wants them all in Title V. I know vocational educators will want a separate one. We're going to have to make some decision between you.

MR. BIXLER: Well, I want to thank each of the members of the panel for their diverse but comprehensive views and certainly thank the members of this audience for their interest and participation. This adjourns the session on this important topic of Vocational Education, 1968.

4-405-IED-I-668-040